

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **14 November 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-33. Claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 13, 15, 16, 23, 24, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Srinivasan et al (USPN 6,751,647, hereinafter "Srinivasan"). Claims 1-5, 7, 12-16, 18, 23-27, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Zintel (USPN 6,779,004, hereinafter "Zintel"). Claims 3, 14, 20, 25, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Kronz (USPN 6,675,196, hereinafter "Kronz"). Claims 6, 17, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Balog et al (USPub 2002/0022453, hereinafter "Balog").

Double patenting rejection

Claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

Applicant respectfully submits the attached terminal disclaimer to obviate any provisional or actual rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent claims 6, 17, and 28 were rejected as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Balog. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Srinivasan and Balog teaches selecting a **communication protocol** to use to transfer data between two components based upon the type of data being transferred (see Balog, paragraph [0010]).

In contrast, the present invention causes two components to negotiate with each other to select a **transfer medium** to use to transfer data based upon the type of data (see paragraph [0039] of the instant application). This is beneficial because it provides a technique for selecting, for example, a shared Fire Wire, IR, or Bluetooth connection as the physical transport medium for transferring data. There is nothing within Srinivasan or Balog, either separately or in concert, which suggests causing two components to negotiate with each other to select a **transfer medium** to use to transfer data based upon the type of data.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, and 23 to clarify that the present invention causes two components to negotiate with each other to select a **transfer medium** to use to transfer data based upon the type of data. These amendments find support in paragraph [0039] of the instant application. Dependent claims 6, 17, and 28 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-11, which depend upon claim 8, claims 13-18, which depend upon claim 12, claims 20-22, which depend upon claim 19, claims 24-29, which depend upon claim 23, and claims 31-33, which depend upon claim 30, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 11 January 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com